**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

# ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 13 January 2016.

PRESENT: Mrs P A V Stockell (Chairman), Mr C R Pearman (Vice-Chairman), Mr M Baldock, Mr C W Caller, Mr I S Chittenden, Dr M R Eddy, Mr P J Homewood, Mr B E MacDowall, Mr J M Ozog, Mr C Simkins, Mrs C J Waters, Mr M E Whybrow and Mr M A Wickham

ALSO PRESENT: Mr P M Hill, OBE and Mr M A C Balfour

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs B Cooper (Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport), Mr A Loosemore (Head of Highway Operations), Miss K Phillips (Strategic Business Adviser - GET), Mr K Tilson (Finance Business Partner - Customer & Communities), Mr R Wilkin (Interim Director of Highways, Transformation and Waste), M D Beaver (Head of Network Management and Performance), Mr D Shipton (Head of Financial Strategy), Mr J Ratcliffe (Principal Transport Planner - Strategy) and Ms C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**139. Apologies and Substitutes**
*(Item A2)*

Apologies were received from Mr Bowles.

**140. Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda**
*(Item A3)*

Mr MacDowall advised that he knew Mr Nigel Collor, Cabinet Member for Access at Dover District Council, who was present to speak on Item C3 “Proposed Response to the Highways England Consultation on a proposal to create a Permanent Lorry Area adjacent to the M20 at Stanford”.

**141. Verbal updates**
*(Item A4)*

1. The Cabinet Member Environment and Transport, Mr Balfour, gave his verbal update. He explained that due to the rainfall throughout December and early January, the ground across Kent was saturated. The rainfall during the week of 4 January added to this causing widespread surface water flooding across the county.

2. KCC received 830 drainage enquiries (put into context, that was more than the busiest week of the 2013/14 winter) and provided 146 two hour drainage callouts. In addition, Highway Operations raised a further 64 emergency & urgent jobs related to the weather.

3. Across the County, most Districts had roads closed last week due to flooding, some were still closed today. East Kent was worst hit; Dover had 18 roads either closed or virtually impassable and Shepway had large areas affected. The teams were excellent through the week, Dover Highway Operations were commended for the work they carried out over this period.

4. Once the water had subsided there was much damage due to debris from the flooding. A selection of photos from Dover District highlights the issues.

5. The gritters had been sent out 8 times over the months of November and January.

6. Mr Balfour advised that the Environment Agency was working with Kent County Council, Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council and Maidstone Borough Council to develop options to reduce the risk of flooding to communities from the River Medway, River Beult and River Tiese. The Environment Agency had now completed its update of their flood model and was using it to test options to reduce risk. The outcomes were expected this month which was slightly behind schedule although the EA has advised that the delay would not affect the design and construction completion dates of 2019 and 2022. (Since the meeting, the Environment Agency has advised that there will be a further delay in reporting on its findings)

7. Mr Balfour advised that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan was submitted for independent examination by a government appointed Planning Inspector in November 2014. Examination Hearings were held in April and May 2015 and as a result a number of Main and Additional (minor) Modifications where proposed to the Plan to address legal soundness matters and ensure that the Plan complies with planning law and policy guidance. Representations on the soundness and legality of the first set of modifications were invited from 17 August 2015 to 12 October 2015; and in light of the responses received the Inspector subsequently wrote to the Council suggesting that several further Main Modifications were necessary to ensure

the soundness of the Plan. These were currently the subject of an eight week public consultation which expired on 4 March 2016. Any views received would be considered by the Inspector in finalising his report. Assuming that he was satisfied with the Plan, his report would pave the way for the County Council to adopt the Plan. Once adopted it becomes the Development Plan against which mineral and waste management planning applications were determined and the allocation criteria for the separate Mineral and Waste Sites Plans.

7. Good progress was being made by many officers in the Directorate and Amey on a diverse range of challenging LEP transport projects with tight spending targets. Mr Balfour gave the following examples:

- Tonbridge High Street works had resumed after the Christmas trading break.
- A26 London Road/Yew Tree Road was about to start.
- Advance works for Maidstone Bridge Gyratory were about to start
- A contract had been awarded for M20J4 for a planned March start.
- Tenders for Rathmore Road, Gravesend would be returned this week for a planned June start.
- There was progress on a number of Local Sustainable Transport and pedestrian schemes.

8. Business Cases had been prepared and submitted to the Local Enterprise Partnership for some 16/17 schemes so that spend could be brought forward to balance out re-profiled spend on current year schemes. A lot of effort was going into public engagement and advance information for these projects.

9. Confirmation was awaited of the dates for the Highways England consultation on the route options for a new Lower Thames Crossing which is expected to run for 10 weeks from late January. There was a Stakeholder Advisory Panel meeting on Friday, 22 January where we hoped for an announcement on the consultation. We expect the consultation to seek views on route options within corridor A (adjacent to the existing Dartford Crossing) and corridor C (to the east of Gravesend). Kent County Council's proposed response would be discussed by this Cabinet Committee in March.

The Cabinet Committee at its last meeting had agreed to a Member Task and Finish Group being set up to look at future options for the future of the Soft Landscaping Contract. The work was being led by the Vice Chairman, Mr Pearman and was scheduled to finish this month and a final report would come to this Cabinet Committee in March for consideration.

Mr Balfour confirmed that following the most recent waste disposal contracts, KCC's target to reduce waste to landfill to 5% before 2020 had already been met.

**142. Inter Authority Agreement in respect of the management of the Waste Project between Kent County Council and Gravesham Borough Council**
*(Item B1)*

1. The Head of Commercial Management and Waste Services, Mr Beaver, introduced a report on the collection and disposal of waste services within the administration area of Gravesham. He explained that Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) had direct service operation which allowed it to design a new scheme of waste

collection to significantly increase its recycling and composting rate by including wheeled bin collection of dry recyclables and separate weekly food waste collections. This scheme put joint risk on both Kent County Council (KCC) and GBC which was a favourable arrangement. The financial agreement took account of the price rises and the changes in government legislation. This arrangement protected KCC if GBC did not reach their targets. KCC could recoup the costs from GBC.

2. Mr Beaver and Mr Balfour responded to questions by Members as follows:

a) A comment was made that GBC welcomed the agreement and considered that it demonstrated that GBC had made significant investment. When local authorities worked together to have a direct service they could influence their own future. This could be the future for other district and borough councils.

b) A comment was made that the wording in paragraph 5.1, "This IAA rewards GBC..", could be considered patronising as this was a partnership. Alternative wording was suggested as follows "The IAA is in recognition of GBC..". Mr Balfour agreed to the suggested revised wording and stated that there was no intention to patronise GBC or any Borough or District Councils as the local authorities needed to work closely together.

3. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the responses to questions by Members be noted; and

(b) the Cabinet Committee endorse the proposed decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for KCC to enter into an Inter Authority Agreement with GBC to increase levels of recycling and reduce disposal costs for KCC as detailed in Appendix A of the report.

**143. Budget 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2016/19**
*(Item C1)*

1. The Head of Financial Strategy, Mr Shipton, gave an overview of the Council's draft revenue and capital budgets and Medium Term Financial Plan. He stressed that this was going to be the most difficult budget Kent County Council (KCC) had faced. He highlighted some of the listed factors prior to the introduction report.

2. He explained that one of the biggest issues was that KCC did not receive the spending plans from central government until the spending review was announced on the 25th November. This meant KCC was not aware of the total financial envelope it was working within. KCC did not get its own individual settlement until 17 December 2015. The settlement received on 17 December included a significant redistribution of Revenue Support Grant that KCC had not been able to anticipate. Of that redistribution the net impact was a £15m reduction on Kent's budget that it could not have anticipated before that announcement. This meant the papers were published for this Cabinet Committee with an assumption that there was still £8m of that £15m to find which was included in the appendices of the report for this Cabinet Committee.

Since the report was published the Draft Budget was published on 11 January, and in that draft another £4m of the £8m had been identified, so there was now £4m left unidentified. None of the extra £4m identified in the published draft budget affected services within the remit of this Cabinet Committee's portfolio; it was nearly all being taken from Financing Items. Mr Shipton stated that there was still a little bit of gap to close which he understood made scrutinising the Budget difficult. He advised that there was not a complete Budget for Members to scrutinise as this was a very late change and was unexpected.

3. Mr Shipton advised that the provisional settlement also included the spending power calculation. This measured Kent's change in funding both through Council Tax and through Government Grants. This took no account of the additional spending requirements Kent County Council was facing either through the effects of inflation or the effects of the rising population or the impact of increasing competitive need. He suggested that the Cabinet Committee looked at the spending power figure which was reproduced in the report but reminded Members that this was only the funding half and not the spending half. He concluded that there were real term reductions in KCC's funding and KCC was not able to raise enough through Council Tax to compensate for both the spending demands and the reductions in central government funding, and therefore there was a need to make substantial savings.

4. Mr Tilson highlighted the detail in the appendices to the report explaining that:

- Appendix 1 - Budget Summary
- Appendix 2 - GET Directorate's MTFP spending prices and savings proposals
- Appendix 3 - An A to Z of Service Analysis
- Appendix 4 - The Capital Investment Plans 2016/17 to 2018/19

5. Mr Balfour, Mr Shipton and Mr Tilson noted comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:

a) A comment was made that it would be helpful to have the measurements in miles rather than kilometres.
b) It was clarified that the majority of the budget reduction was to be achieved through spending reductions including the move to direct billing of utilities to the pitch holder. Previously KCC paid and recharged.
c) Mr Shipton advised that the Council Tax referendum level for 2016/17 was 2% and would raise £11.2m. Mr Shipton explained that the next version of the budget book would be published with more detail.
d) Mr Wilkin advised that the income from recycling and composting was on a downward cycle but would come up again. There was a healthy income over the years but this was typical of this market.
e) Mr Balfour advised that Kent was a well-managed authority compared to others and would with others match fund the £17m of Highways England funding for flooding defence.
f) Mr Shipton agreed that if the revenue support grant continued to be reduced there would be no further capital money as KCC cannot borrow more if the ratio of borrowing costs (interest and repayments) exceeded 15% of the net budget.
g) It was suggested that KCCs response should challenge why the recalculation of the revenue support grant meant that the money was going

to the London boroughs. Mr Balfour advised that for every £1 per head Kent received, London received £4 for looking after the elderly.

6. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted; and

(b) the draft Budget and MTFP (including responses to consultation and Government announcements) be noted prior consideration by Cabinet on 25 January 2016 and County Council on 11 February 2016.

**144. Cabinet Members' Priorities for Business Plans 2016/17**
*(Item C2)*

1. The Strategic Business Adviser, Ms Phillips, introduced a report that sought comments from the Cabinet Committee on the Cabinet Members' priorities they wished to be reflected in the 2016/17 directorate business plans as set out in pages 76 and 77 of the report. Ms Phillips explained that many of the priorities would be jointly delivered by several services across the directorate and there were cross-cutting priorities which would be reflected in all the county council directorates' business plans eg developing and implementing the district deals. The priorities would be reflected in the business plan and would help shape and inform the directorates' and divisions' priorities for 2016/17. Work was being undertaken with each of the divisions to identify the priorities and identify the commissioning activity for the next three years.

2. A draft of the business plan would be submitted to this Cabinet Committee on 11 March meeting for comment. All of the Directorates' business plans would then be approved collectively by Cabinet Members by early May.

3. Mr Hill highlighted his priorities on future integrated Resilience and Community Safety from his portfolio explaining that the Kent Police and Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue had joined to form an integrated team base at Fire Headquarters at Loose Road, Maidstone. His aim was to have closer working with the health partners and collate information from public personnel eg parking wardens, community wardens etc that would to be analysed and collated to be used in reducing community safety issues. He concluded that Trading Standards also had a role to play in community safety with its success in prosecuting rogue traders etc.

4. Mr Balfour stressed the importance of each of the priorities within the remit of his portfolio listed on page 76. He added that he wanted to add to the list "How we encourage drivers being more courteous and considerate on Kent roads".

5. Mr Balfour responded to questions by Members as follows:

a) A suggestion was made that consultations and working closer with Parish and Town councils should be embedded within KCC's work as they could take on more responsibilities but often needed advice on how to start. Mr Balfour agreed with the suggestion and to the Parish councils being given the capability to take on more responsibilities. Although they were not mentioned in the list they were embedded in partnership working.

b) Ms Phillips advised that the Cabinet Members' list of priorities would be embedded into the directorate business plan and would not be a separate list. Some of the priorities would be grouped such as Heritage, the rural agenda and the Kent Environment Strategy with an overarching heading that encapsulated them all. The two cross-cutting priorities listed on page 77 were listed because the District Deals came under the remit of Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate (GET) while every directorate has a lead on the PREVENT priority; the other cross-cutting priorities in Appendix 1 are ones we all contribute to, but will be led by other directorates.
c) Mr Balfour explained that the priority "Make on-street parking arrangements across the county more cost effective to deliver significant revenue savings" would be part of an overall package to help district and borough council colleagues to find ways to reduce costs eg looking at whether managing parking back office functions could be dealt with on a more centralised basis. This is a discussion that needs to be had, and not for KCC to dictate.
d) A comment was made that the maintenance of white lines on carriageways should be reflected in carriageway maintenance as they made it easier to see road junctions, especially at night. Mr Balfour suggested that white lines indicated the edge of the road so drivers therefore do not have to think about it and could consequently drive faster. However if drivers have to think about where they are going, then they would have to drive more carefully and courteously.
e) A comment was made whether a more effective context could be made for public transport within the list of priorities. Mr Balfour said that there is a commitment for public transport which is subject to finance.
f) A suggestion was made that anything to alleviate Operation Stack was welcomed. This impacted on many businesses and charities in Kent.
g) A comment was made regarding the reference to Heritage and rural being put together as there were a lot of heritage sites in the urban context and the categorisation of heritage and rural should be avoided. Mr Balfour agreed and gave the example of Western Heights which was in a quasi-urban rural setting. He said that in the context of "landscaping" this could be rural or urban too.
h) A suggestion was made regarding the cross cutting priority "ask the market to solve problems", that it could also say "asking the market not to create problems" eg land banking. Mr Balfour said that this was market engagement and KCC needed to make sure that it was getting the best possible resolution to problems through good commissioning and procurement.
i) A comment was made that road signs should be kept clean and foliage on the sides of the highways be cut back. There was a need to ensure that visitors had a good overall experience when visiting Kent. Town and Parish councils in the East of Kent were keen to carry out soft landscaping. Mr Balfour considered that it may be better for road signs etc to be maintained locally by Town and Parish councils. Mr Hill added that there was a need to look at what the Parish Councils could do locally and appropriate funding being provided for the tasks they undertake.
j) Mr Balfour said that the future of the Members Highway Fund would be addressed as part of the overall budget.
k) Members gave examples of working with Parish Councils to fund projects by using their Member's grant to gain match funding from Parish Councils.

6. Mr Loosemoore advised that he had been working with Tenterden Town Council as they wanted to take up the Parish village caretaking and work was being undertaken on how that responsibility could be shared and devolved especially regarding soft landscaping and grass cutting in the area.

7. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the comments and the responses to questions by Members be noted;

(b) the Cabinet Members' priorities for the 2016/17 directorate business plans be noted; and

(c) a further report be submitted to the March meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

**145. Proposed Response to the Highways England Consultation on a proposal to create a Permanent Lorry Area adjacent to the M20 at Stanford**
*(Item C3)*

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Balfour, introduced a report on a proposed response to the consultation by Highways England on a proposal to create a Permanent Lorry Area adjacent to the M20 at Stanford, Ashford. He highlighted the problems that the County had endured over the years when there were issues with lorries being unable to enter the Channel Tunnel and in particular this summer's problems which drew the government's attention as it became a national problem and cost the country millions of pounds. The government asked that a solution be found by Highways England at a pace. Mr Balfour steered the Cabinet Committee to only discuss the proposed response to the consultation and not what had gone before. He said that he supported the retention of the Traffic Assessment Phase (TAP) scheme and that it should be carried out in a sophisticated way with variable speed limits and the queue into TAP should be reduced as much as possible.

2. The Chairman had given permission in advance of the meeting to the Local Member for Elham Valley, Miss Susan Carey; and the Cabinet Member for Access, Councillor Nigel Collor, Dover District Council, to speak on this item.

3. Miss Carey welcomed the opportunity to speak at the meeting. She advised that the residents of Elham Valley, who were amongst those who had suffered the worst as a result of Operation Stack and now felt punished by the Highways England's proposal. Both sites identified were not considered a good idea. Miss Carey welcomed the £250m found to fund a solution but was disappointed that Highways England was asked to look for a site for a lorry park and that it would have been more sensible for them to be asked to produce options for resolving Operation Stack. Miss Carey highlighted that Highways England's consultation document was headed "Managing Freight Vehicles through Kent" and concluded that the document did not have much about managing freight but dwelled on a lorry park. The lorry park would only hold so many lorries and would therefore not prevent lorries parking up around Kent. She suggested that the sites chosen by Highways England were not options on the list produced by KCC because KCC would not have received permission for them because they fell outside many policies of KCC. Miss Carey welcomed the parts of the report before Members that considered a bigger solution of

what could be done further upstream to stop lorries coming into Kent in the first place, the infrastructure that was need to support the traffic that we already have. She considered that Stanford West was the right and least bad option, including the lower Thames crossing. Miss Carey supported what the report said in terms of which option should be chosen if there was going to be one. She considered that Stanford West was the right choice for the reasons set out in the report. Miss Carey considered that the way the Highways England consultation document was produced and written made it difficult to come to that conclusion as it lack necessary detail. Highways England had advised that it could not give more detail until the site had been chosen and what it was going to be used for. Miss Carey considered that it should be the other way round ie layout first and what the operation was to be for each of the different options so that consultees could make an intelligent response.

4. Miss Carey considered that this was a poor consultation and advised that as this was not a statutory consultation residents were not entitled to compensation under the Blight regulations when they come forward with a firm plan. She advised that local residents had already lost house sales and their plans were on hold. Miss Carey considered that a similar scheme should be operated as when the Channel Tunnel was built where people were allowed to sell their properties at the market rate that it would have been before the impact of the proposals. People could not have expected to see this coming. The issues in the report regarding environmental protection were welcomed. She urged the Cabinet Committee Members to support the need for generosity to those who were faced with this on their doorstep.

5. Councillor Collor read out a submission which had the support of various community hotelier and business groups in Dover.

> "Dover District Council fully supports the principle of your report and agrees that Stanford West was far the best solution of the two sites under consideration. We also support what is described as alternative three. It would maximise the facilities for lorry drivers while avoiding replicating facilities available at stop 24. However, we do have concerns when reading within your report the statement that the main part of the site on the north side of the motorway, to be used exclusively for HGV queueing in a replacement for Dover TAP and Eurotunnel excess with a dedicated access from the M20. More effective management which is being discussed is likely to reduce the frequency for Dover TAP but we at Dover will be continuing to lobby extensively for the retention of Dover TAP and indeed as we have been doing so for the past few months seek for the current trial period to be made permanent. Dover also has a freight clearance depot in direct competition with the facilities at top 24 so local employment needs protecting. Since its introduction in April 2015, Dover TAP has been used 138 times to control the flow of freight vehicles through central Dover. As most of you will appreciate the A20 between the southern end of the M20 and Dover Eastern Docks bisects Dover with businesses and tourists not having easy access between the town centre and well photographed and award winning seafront. Pre TAP, Dover used to suffer from queues of trucks stretching back from the Docks entrance usually three or four evenings a week as the norm, during the adverse weather it was far worse they use to block accesses to businesses and residential properties, junctions roundabouts, pedestrian crossings, making the A20, which through Dover is also a local road, extremely dangerous, there was a fatal crash there last weekend. TAP, Traffic Assessment Phase, is very apt, as its control at the Western roundabout by the Port of Dover Police and drip feeds traffic through to the Eastern Docks at a rate that facilities can handle, it was not a stationary

queue. This elevates the need for trucks to queue along the A20, through the town and allows Dover to go about its business, bus services to flow to time and emergency vehicles to get through, to name but a few things other towns enjoy. The queues of trucks through the town on the A20 often described as a nocuous wall of steel has led to the need to declare an air quality management area between the Western Heights roundabout on the docks that has to be monitored daily and an annual report sent to DEFRA stating what actions are being taken to address it. Early indications are that TAP is helping to address this situation. The detrimental impact of this routine congestion has had in recent years on residents, visitors and more importantly the local economy should not be under estimated given that it potentially creates a negative image of Dover deterring inward investment by the private sector at a time when the Council's regeneration agenda is at last gaining momentum. When Operation Stack was on before we had TAP, Trucks use to be let go from Stack in numbers that were too great for the Port to handle and Dover had queues back. This proves that traffic through Dover cannot be controlled from 10 or 11 miles away as is suggested in your report when it refers to the lorry park replacing TAP. In saying this it needs to be taken into account that this is not the only route into Dover that trucks find, they use the A2, A256, A258, B2011as well as minor roads into the town often causing chaos by mentioning this point, truck drivers were always looking for a way round controls and should there be no control between the proposed lorry Park and Dover you will find that trucks will soon be bypassing it by trundling down the A20 from Ashford through the villages, Sellindge and Westenhanger and seriously affecting roads to other villages. In the absence of TAP our problem will be yours tomorrow. The proposed lorry park should be complimenting and supporting Dover with TAP not replacing it. We are in discussions with the Port of Dover, Kent Police, Highways England and others to iron out some of the issues associated with TAP that require attention, possibly the main one here is the six miles of 40 mile per hour speed limit that Highways England have already some advance plans to turn this into a variable speed limit that will only be enforced when TAP is actioned. Added to this, plans were in hand to improve the yellow boxes at the junctions. We respectfully request that the use of the Port of Dover TAP be made permanently".

6. Mr Balfour reminded Members that this was not KCC's consultation and therefore KCC had no control over the production of the document. He stated that KCC was looking at technology as a means of connecting with; the five major freight companies that came through Dover; and the Port of Dover to enable better management of those lorries before they reached Kent and once they reach Kent, as part of the solution. He considered that it was also important for Kent to build up a network of commercial lorry parks across the country which would require the government's support.

7. Mr Balfour then spoke on local commercial lorry parks. There was a need for those private commercial parks to be viable. He advised that KCC was making strong representations with Highways England. Members were advised that the former Gateway Committee had been reconvened. Its Membership included all those local authorities concerned, freight representatives and as many of the operators of commercial lorry parks as possible, Kent Police, Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue and Highways England to find a solution on how best the commercial aspects of lorry parking, overnight storage, could best be done. This would also include the input from ship operators, ports, the Channel Tunnel etc.

8. Mr Balfour stated that it was vital that lorry drivers had surety that if they joined the queue or lorry park as number eight they were the eighth lorry to leave the queue.

9. Mr Balfour received comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:

a) Mrs Waters broadly supported the report and strongly supported the local Member, Miss Carey. She reinforced the words on pages 88 and 89, paragraph 2.7, in the report regarding compensation and asked that KCC support those residents affected. She made the following comments; (i) Highways England's consultation document was vague which made it difficult to respond to. (ii) she was not convinced that this was the right solution to Operation Stack and that more work should have been carried out by Highways England. (iii) More commercial parks were needed north of the M20 which was where the majority of the lorries were travelling to; (iv) there was a need to look after our residents and businesses that were badly affected when Operation Stack was at its worst; (v) the miles of lorries parked up during Operation Stack in the Summer sent out the wrong messages to people coming to Kent; and (vi) was happy to support Dover District Council wish to retain Dover TAP. Mr Balfour agreed to reinforce the support for local residents receiving compensation in the response to the consultation.
b) Mr Eddy agreed with the statement made by Cllr Collor.
c) Mr Balfour agreed to the suggestion that the wording in a sentence in paragraph 2.4, line 5 from the words "; and the Port of Dover queue…" being reworded.
d) Referring to page 87, paragraph 2.5, within the final sentence "…, including the bifurcation of traffic between the M20/A20 and M/A2 corridors…." a suggestion was made that if this happened it would require the duelling of the A2 at the Dover end which should be included in this document [This reference was in the "Growth without Gridlock" documentation]. Mr Balfour agreed to this being mentioned in the response to the consultation.
e) He advised Members that there was the likelihood of KCC would respond to the Lower Thames Crossing in the future and that Highways England was being careful how they discuss the added infrastructure required.
f) A comment was made that the feeling in Dover was that as the West of Kent was affected by Operation Stack for a relative short time gave additional impetus to a solution for Operation Stack.
g) Mr Eddy said that Dover lived with Operation Stack in one way or another on a regular basis. This had a serious impact on Dover's economic regeneration programme and on existing businesses. He considered that this needed to be resolved not just in terms of a solution of a lorry park for particularly severe times but required consideration at a national level. He had sympathy with Miss Carey's local residents and felt that they were right to worry about air quality although the people of Dover had been putting up with problems with air quality for a long time.
h) Mr Balfour advised all Members had received an invitation to a special briefing with Highways England held last week and the Highways England document had a locality map within it.
i) Mr Caller considered that option three was the best option. He was pleased to note the comments regarding Dover TAP. He considered that part of the solution was for lorry parks to be located further north. Mr Balfour assured Members that national solutions were being considered.

Dover offered speed and efficiency audit was impossible for Kent to dictate to hauliers how they travelled.

j) A Member commented that this had been a well-balanced well constructive debate.

k) Mr Whybrow advised that he did not support the recommendation in the report and considered the consultation a poor document that lacked detail. He considered it a kneejerk reaction. He suggested that KCC should respond saying that there should be a pause and that a more strategic look be taken to where the £250m should be spent. He said that he was unimpressed by the Highways England briefing where Members were advised that; (i) this was the only feasible site for the lorry park; and (ii) there could be only one large lorry park [a decision they advised was reached after consulting with the freight industry]; and (iii) the exit slip way was not going to be compliant and as a result there would be variable speed limit on the A20 to cope with the 3600 HGVs. Mr Whybrow advised that the predictions on the increased volume of HGVs coming through Dover meant that by the time the lorry park was built it would be taking up some of the increase in volume and this would still leave the same number of HGVs as there were now on the M20 when Operation Stack arose. Mr Whybrow considered that this report contradicted the work carried out by KCC a year ago on various sites for lorry parks when at the time the Stanford site was rejected due to issues of access and operation, landscape, serious environmental constraints, ecology, stakeholders and reference to the blight on Sellindge and Stanford. Mr Whybrow strongly suggested that this was not a proper consultation and the preferred option had already been decided.

l) Mr Balfour stated that this was not a kneejerk reaction. He disagreed with the suggestion that KCC should respond to the consultation asking for Highway's England to look at this again. Kent had been trying to find a solution for many years, but did not have the funds for a solution. He stressed that this was not Kent's consultation and a considerable number of sites had been looked at by KCC and by Highways England, which had been specifically involved since February 2015. Kent would be doing all it could through the use of technology and developing commercial lorry parks across the country for a holistic solution of which this was a part.

m) Mr Baldock made the following points: (i) this was not a solution and the proposed location was an unsuitable site and would not solve the problem. He suggested that; (ii) the countryside would be destroyed for the occasional use as a lorry park; (iii) it was not a money maker and therefore would not pay for itself; (iv) it would be a white elephant; (v) he agreed with Mr Whybrow's response to the consultation; (vi) as Highways England had disregarded KCC's policies he feared that this could be done again in the future; and (vii) he reflected on other schemes when compensation was not supported by the local authority.

n) Mr MacDowall made the following comments; (i) he supported having lorry parks around the country; (ii) he agreed that a major lorry park being at the Stanford West site; (iii) he suggested that a representative from the Highways Agency or the freight industry be invited to a meeting with Members to discuss logistics and whether having the site near the port was the best one; (iv) he had concerns about the slip road not being compliant and made a request for this to be challenged; (v) he considered that Dover had suffered congestion in the area for many years but he would like to see Dover TAP removed but at a later date; (vi)he considered that the A2

should be duelled to create an alternate route out of Dover. Mr Balfour responded to Mr Baldock and Mr MacDowall confirming that the £250m would be used solely for the construction of the lorry park. He advised that HGV representatives had already been invited to private meetings and had met with the Gateway Committee. At those meeting they confirmed that Dover was where HGV's would travel to and from as it was quickest and shortest route from Europe to the UK.

10. Following Members comments, Mr Balfour concluded that the response to the Highway England would stand subject to the inclusion of (i) the need for a better TAP; (ii) reinforcing the need for proper compensation for residents; and (iii) a push for the other factors that were needed to ensure proper management of HGVs across the country because it was a national problem.

11. Mr Whybrow moved and Mr Baldock seconded, the following amendment:

*"That KCC's response to the consultation paper should be that a more strategic look at the whole option of lorry parks and how the £250m was going to be spent and that Kent did not support the Stanford West lorry park fundamentally".*

12. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the proposed amendment and agreed to Mr Whybrow and Mr Baldock request for the votes to be recorded, the votes cast were as follows:

*For (2)*
*Mr Baldock, Mr Whybrow*
*Against (11)*
*Mr Caller, Dr Eddy, Mr Chittenden, Mr Homewood, Mr Ozog, Mr Pearman, Mrs Stockell, Mr Simkins, Mrs Waters, Mr Wickham, Mr MacDowall.*

*Amendment lost*

13. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the recommendation in the report subject to the additional comments raised in paragraph above, the votes cast were as follows:

*For (11)*
*Mr Caller, Dr Eddy, Mr Chittenden, Mr Homewood, Mr Ozog, Mr Pearman, Mrs Stockell, Mr Simkins, Mrs Waters, Mr Wickham, Mr MacDowall.*
*Against (2)*
*Mr Baldock, Mr Whybrow*

*carried*

14. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted; and

(b) subject to the inclusion of; (i) the need for a better TAP; (ii) reinforcing the need for proper compensation for residents; and (iii) a push for the other factors that were needed to ensure proper management of HGVs across the nation as this was a national problem the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee endorsed the proposed response to the Highways

England Consultation on a proposal to create a Permanent Lorry Area adjacent to the M20 at Stanford as set out in the report.

**146. The Approach to Maintaining our Highway Assets**
*(Item C4)*

1. The Interim Deputy Director Highways Transportation and Waste, Mr Loosemore, introduced a report on the approach taken to maintain the highway assets and highlighted the challenges faced by the County Council going forward. Mr Loosemore outlined the need for a Member Task and Finish Group to be set up to support the development of the approach to highway asset management in Kent.

2. Mr Balfour and Mr Loosemore responded to questions by Members as follows:

3. Mr Loosemore highlighted the changes to the block grant maintenance received from government. This had now been split into three different portions. We no longer receive block funding as a right. There were now two extra elements; (1) the Challenge fund bid and (2) the incentive fund bid. He then spoke on the importance of the Incentive Fund questionnaire, a self-assessment document that would need to be carried out and submitted to the DfE accompanied by supporting evidence. The score achieved would determine the level of funding received. Members noted that the aim was to achieve Band 2 overall to then work to a Band 3 score.

4. Mr Balfour agreed that there were more pressures with far less funding being made available. He suggested that there was a need to think more cleverly in dealing with Kent's highways assets. Mr Balfour advised that he regularly met with Mr Wilkin, Mr Loosemore and Mr Pearman to discuss highways issues. Maintenance of the highways assets needed to be carried out at the right level. Members noted that this would form part of the discussion on the next highways contract which was currently with Amey.

5. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the responses to questions by Members be noted;

(b) the Cabinet Committee noted the challenges highlighted in the report and supported further embedding of asset management principles in KCC approach to highways maintenance; and

(c) a Member Task and Finish Group be set up to support the development of the approach to highway asset management in Kent.

**147. Kent County Council Response to the Department for Transport Report on the First Interim Evaluation of High Speed 1**
*(Item C5)*

1. The Corporate Director for Growth Environment and Transport, Mrs Cooper, introduced a report that sets out Kent County Council's response to the Department for Transport's First Interim Evaluation of High Speed 1 (HS1) that had been operating since 2009. She advised that the report also included the direct impact on

passenger numbers which had risen and the welcomed regeneration in areas such as Ashford and Canterbury along its route.

2. Mrs Cooper advised that Mr Gasche continued to pursue Network Rail and Southeastern for the repairs to be undertaken at a pace on the Dover Priory to Folkestone line.

3. Mrs Cooper responded to questions by Members which included the following:

a) Mr Baldock commented that he considered the report one sided as it did not reflect on the impact HS1 had on residents in rural areas, such as Newington, Teynham and Sellindge. He suggested that residents did not receive the train service in his electoral area, Swale West, they had enjoyed in the past because HS1 had superseded previous routes. He considered that the HS1 route from Sittingbourne to London St Pancreas station that saved seven minutes journey time was to the wrong part of London ie, and cost more money. It was considered that the majority of people that worked in London required routes to London Bridge and London Victoria stations.
b) Mr Baldock stated that there had been a huge population growth in Kent over this period, mainly with people who moved to Kent and who travelled to work in London. The large increase in the number of train passengers on HS1 could be attributed to that growth and not HS1. People who lived and travelled to work within Kent were not serviced by HS1.
c) A suggestion was made that residents who had suffered the impact of HS1 through longer journey's to work and increased traffic congestion should be consulted and their comments included in the report. Mr Balfour advised that the report was on HS1 and not the classic service. KCC had to lobby government regarding the new Southeastern franchise this year. Reports on the classic service would be submitted to future meetings of the Cabinet Committee.
d) Mr MacDowall concurred with Mr Baldock's comments. He said that HS1 was more attractive if you lived or had a business along the HS1 line. He considered that the benefits that came from the HS1 service came at the expense of the classic service. A large number of Kent's population lived on the coastal strip between Dartford and Dover and they were not receiving a better service. Mr MacDowall considered that HS1 was high speed in name but not high speed throughout and if high speed was to improve the track from Ebbsfleet to St Pancreas, London would need to be replaced long term to bring it up to the same standard, this would be costly. It would be difficult to limit annual increases to the cost of inflation. If demand grew it was likely that prices would rise with inflation to accommodate the demand.
e) Mr Whybrow suggested two additions to the response to the consultation; (i) more investment needed in the competing mainline services; and (ii) a recommendation from KCC that HS1openned up as much as possible to freight to reduce the HGV volume on Kent's roads. Mr Balfour agreed with Mr Whybrow that the Channel Tunnel should be used for freight. He advised that he and Mr Dance were meeting with operators and representatives from Euro Tunnel tomorrow afternoon to discuss how this can be moved forward.

f) Mrs Waters praised the HS1 link from Ashford to London and that overall it had been successful for the Romney Marsh area and was a good thing for Kent.
g) Mr Caller said that it was incorrect to say that the inter Kent services were detrimental because you could use those services within Kent but not on the high speed sections of the line. There were a lot of areas in Kent that benefitted from the high speed service, unfortunately it had to run on conventional lines from Ashford to Ebbsfleet it joined the North Kent Line. He questioned HS1 being used to for freight locomotives and wagons that would be travelling at 60 miles per hour on the same lines where trains were running at 140 miles per hour.
h) Mr Simkins endorsed the report and considered that HS1 had been fantastic for Kent. The provider had increased services to meet the capacity. He did not feel that there was deterioration in the classic service and said that it was important that we say that the other services were still good, were used and available. It was important to ensure that they did not deteriorate.
i) A comment was made that before the Dover to Folkestone line was shut indefinitely to trains after huge cracks appeared in the sea wall along the stretch, HS1 was particularly beneficial to those that lived in Deal and Walmer.

4. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and

(b) subject to consideration be given to additional comments being added to the response on the classic service and the line being opened to freight the Cabinet Committee endorsed the proposed service enhancements that Kent County Council would seek in its response to the Department for Transport's consultation on the new Southeastern franchise specification.

**148. Work Programme 2016**
*(Item C6)*

1. The Cabinet Committee considered the proposed work programme and requested that the "draft business plan" be added to the March agenda.

2. RESOLVED that subject to the draft business plan being added to the March 2016 agenda the work programme 2016 be agreed.